

THE DUTCH FLAT ENQUIRER.

THE PEOPLE'S NEWSPAPER:—Devoted to Religion, Politics, Education, Mining, and General Intelligence, Foreign and Domestic.—INDEPENDENT ON ALL SUBJECTS.

VOL. IV.

DUTCH FLAT, PLACER CO., CAL., THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 18, 1863.

NO. 4.

Dutch Flat Enquirer.

Published every Thursday Morning
BY E. H. ROUST.
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Office, on Sacramento Street, Dutch Flat.
TERMS:
For one year, (in advance) \$6 00
" Six months, " 3 50
" Three months, " 2 50
Single copies, 10 cents.
Unless express notice be given to the contrary, the paper will be continued after the time paid for has expired.

No paper is sent until all arrearages are paid.
Business Letters or Communications should be addressed to The Dutch Flat Enquirer.

ADVERTISING RATES:
One square of ten lines, first insertion, \$3 00
Each subsequent insertion, 1 00
A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year or quarter.

All transient advertisements must be accompanied by the money.
No communication of a personal nature will be inserted unless paid for double the usual advertising rates.

Advertisements should be marked the number of insertions desired, otherwise they will be published till ordered out, and payment enforced.
Progressive Rates, inserted in the card column and containing six lines or less, will be charged as follows: Three months, \$3 00; Six months, \$5 00; Twelve months, \$7 00.

Editorial Notices, calling attention to advertisements, or any enterprise to benefit individual interest, will be charged for at the rate of thirty cents a line. Special Notices will be charged one-half more than regular advertisements.

Advertisements in order to appear the same week must be sent in by Tuesday afternoon.
Notices of Births, Marriages and Deaths inserted without charge.

GENERAL DIRECTORY.

District Court, 11th Judicial District.—Hon. B. F. Myers, Judge. Meets at Auburn on the second Monday in January, April, and July, and the third Monday in October.

County Court and Court of Sessions.—E. H. Van Lear, Judge. Meets on the fourth Monday in January and May, and the second Monday in September.

Probate Court.—Meets on the fourth Monday in each month.

SUPERVISORS.

District No. 1. J. R. Rogers, Supervisor.

District No. 2. D. W. Mahlon, Supervisor.

District No. 3. Michael Fannon, Supervisor.

POST OFFICES IN PLACER COUNTY.

Auburn. A. N. Gambell, P. M.

Dutch Flat. D. B. Good, P. M.

Danvers. T. M. Clark, P. M.

Forest Hill. R. Parkhurst, P. M.

Grizzly Bear House. E. D. C. Fossett, P. M.

Iowa Hill. S. S. Cullen, P. M.

Lincoln. J. Barnes, P. M.

Mountain Springs. D. S. Cullen, P. M.

Michigan Bluff. J. Washburn, P. M.

Neillburg. A. C. Neal, P. M.

Oroville. D. C. Neal, P. M.

Railroad. D. S. Cullen, P. M.

Sheridan. J. Hart, P. M.

The Valley. J. M. Miner, P. M.

Virginia. D. B. Good, P. M.

Yukon. J. M. Miner, P. M.

BUSINESS CARDS.

E. H. ROUST, Justice of the Peace, Township No. 1. Office at Sacramento street, Dutch Flat.

S. A. MILLER, Constable, Town of N. L. and General Agent and Collector, N. L. and accounts placed in his hands will receive prompt attention. Office at Sacramento street, Dutch Flat.

W. C. JONES, Preaching Physician. Will practice Medicine in Dutch Flat and all the other places in Placer County. Office at the Old Corner, on Main street, Dutch Flat.

C. U. LEE, Pastoral Surgeon, will give his entire attention to the medical and surgical treatment of all diseases. Office at the Old Corner, on Main street, Dutch Flat.

H. PETERSON, M. D., Physician and Surgeon. Office at the Express Office, on Main street, Dutch Flat.

B. ARNOLD, Attorney and Counselor at Law. Office at Main street, Dutch Flat.

HALE & ANDERSON, Attorneys and Counselors at Law, office in the brick building, next door to the County Hospital, Auburn, Cal.

J. A. HAMILTON, THOS. H. WILLIAMS, District Attorneys.

HAMILTON & WILLIAMS, Attorneys and Counselors at Law, Auburn, Cal.

C. A. TWEED, E. L. CRAIG, Attorneys and Counselors at Law. Will practice in all the courts of Placer and the adjoining counties. Office in Auburn, in the Myers' building, Court street, next to the Temple station.

W. & P. NICHOLLS, Main Street, Dutch Flat, California.

Highest Price Paid for Gold Dust.

They also draw on SACRAMENTO & SAN FRANCISCO, FREE.

NEW YORK AND LONDON. ADVANCES made on gold dust for coinage.

J. M. CHILDS, DENTIST.

PREPARED TO PERFORM ALL operations pertaining to Dentistry in a first class manner.

Office—On Main Street, first door above Wildcat store, Dutch Flat.

H. HUBBARD, J. M. HALL, & C. ALLEN, BANKERS.

AUBURN, TODD'S VALLEY AND DUTCH FLAT, Placer County, California.

Pay the highest price for Gold Dust. Make advances on Gold Dust consigned for Assay or Coinage. Also receive gold and silver bullion, and all kinds of Bankers' Business.

JUSTICE AND LAWYERS' BLANKS FOR use cheap, at this office.

AN ODE TO GIBSON.

BY JOHN G. SAGE.

O Gibson! Gibson! I hear the nation's prayers;
O Gibson! how rebels sneer and patriots groan!
To see the way you're managing affairs;
O Gibson, take the hint—and take your leave!
Your friends declare that ere the war began,
"Can't deny, and therefore I admit it,"
Then why, O Gibson, did you ever quit it?
I don't despise the smallest Christian grace;
I reverence the best merit, I confess;
Long may you live—but in your proper place;
And may your mighty hand be never less!
But if of water you are weakly fond!
Why, Gibson, suffer from the sea's communion?
Go sail a pleasure-boat upon a pond;
And let old seamen dare the angry ocean!
Retire, O Gibson, to an onion farm;
Ply any trade that's honest and slow;
Do anything, work you can do no harm;
To any where you fancy—only go!

At all ages with one in your condition;
And when you next disengage—I won't say what—
For God's sake, Gibson, throw up your commission!

[From the National Intelligencer.]

MR. AMBROSE'S LETTERS.

LETTER IV.

SECESSION.

If we could accord to the philosophy of the Southern school the merit of even a plausible theory, in its investigation of the right of secession, and could admit that it secured a principle which in a State might, in some possible emergency, find it useful to bring into practice for its own advantage, and that, contemplating the rare occurrences of such a possibility, the framers of the Constitution did really intend to give it place in their scheme as a substitute for revolution, we should find ourselves arrested at that point by the remarkable failure of the Constitution to provide for its own execution; and in the total absence of all regulation upon this subject, we should be obliged to conclude that the failure of the scheme was abandoned, or that, in some moment of drowsy forgetfulness, these notoriously vigilant and astute gentlemen whom we are accustomed to laud as the sages of our golden age—Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, and the rest—had withdrawn from their watch and let their otherwise consummate work not only finished but actually too imperfect to admit of the first step towards the demonstration of this element, which, it is said, they intended to incorporate into the structure. On this matter of secession they preserved a silence so profound, and so extraordinary—if they had any such consciousness of its existence—as to make the most obscure and helpless of antiquarian studies to determine, at this day, whether a solitary man of that era ever dreamed of secession. Nothing so difficult now as to tell when it was first thought of, who originated it, and where it is to be found, and the numerous other matters affecting the public peace and safety, which this destructive process would call for investigation.

To make secession what is claimed to be, a peaceful proceeding, would require a code of legislation of the highest wisdom. Without such legislation its attempt could be nothing else than a turbulent and headlong rush into a melee of three political strife.

Now, we are to suppose that, with all these necessities and direful consequences in view, our fathers consented in silence to this magnificent power; that they delivered to their posterity the great work of their hands; that they created an Union designed to be as perfect and as nearly perfect as human wisdom could make it—with the seeds of this most destructive planted in its heart, planted with their knowledge and approval; that they made no provision to mitigate its violence or assuage the pain of its stroke; did not even name it, but left it a silent lurking poison in the inmost depths of the Constitution, to destroy the life of the nation whenever occasion might awaken it into activity. We are to believe this and then exalt our fathers amongst the benefactors of mankind, as the first founders of a State, who ever had the sagacity to provide a power for the early and swift destruction of their own work, and to leave that power under the simple guidance of its own unregulated discretion, or, as present events interpret it, its own blind passion.

This conclusion is the most revolting to us, when we reflect in the light of events now disturbing the country, by what dishonest means a State may be driven to practice this method of separation; how much is at the hazard of faction; how the proceeding may be procured by a forced vote against the will of the people; how it may be stimulated by the mad impulses of a day, in some access of that capricious rage which the passions of the multitude are so easily excited by popular leaders. This step once taken, the natural drift of events soon makes it irrevocable. No day of calmer judgment, no future repentance of a generation weeping over the crime of their ancestors, may happily find the juncture suitable to restoration. Or if that season to retrieve the error come, how mournfully may it illustrate, by its day, the dreadful catastrophe of a plunge into an abyss from which the return is only through an ocean of blood and years of sorrow.

Turning aside from these considerations, which seem to be sufficiently cogent of themselves to settle the question, I propose to devote this article to a few remarks upon what I regard as the total unsoundness of the argument by which the advocates of the right of secession generally undertake to maintain it. They are accustomed to affirm that it legitimately results from the theory of the original or antecedent sovereignty of the States; that the States, when they entered into the compact of Union, reserved all the rights of absolute sovereignty, to be resumed by them, whenever they, in their own judgment of the necessity, might think proper to do so. They go further than this, and, refining upon the nature of sovereignty, they say that this right to resume did not require any

assertion as a reserved power, but necessarily resulted from the inherent and indelible quality of sovereignty; that it is of no avail in the argument to inquire whether the framers of the Union had or had not a conception of secession, the right to withdraw from the compact was still there in virtue of the original sovereignty, and could not be given away even by the State itself. I have no objection to this "high law" kind of divine right, for above the Constitution and Union, a right which lay in *ambrosia*, or in language more suitable to its high pretension—in the empyrean, until it was wanted here on earth. This is the transcendental extreme of the Southern philosophy on the subject. The Legislature of the State of Virginia, in this respect, is simply *repealed* the declaration of their assent to the ratification of the Constitution; repealed, as Mr. Everett has well stated it, "an historical fact"—implying, by that act, that what was once a fact of past time is no longer a fact; they repealed the fact that, in the year 1789, Virginia agreed to this compact of Union on the terms proposed—in an incident no more reputable than the surrender of Yorktown. The act of ratification was a deed, not a law; it was a grant of fidelity to the United States, which neither party conceived was an act subject to any modification or repeal by any future Legislature or convention. Since that day the higher law has been discovered, and has been brought down from its cloudy abode—the *deus ex machina*—to throw our whole continent into confusion.

I need not say, after what I have written in my previous letter, that I totally dissent from every view of this question which is based on secession; but, for the present, I permit all objection to the theory it proposes, and proceed to notice the conditions in which it leaves the question.

Suppose it be a sound principle that this right results from the original sovereignty of the State, and that no compact, however solemn, can bind a State to the maintenance or circumstances of its sovereignty attributes longer than it is its own continuous will to be bound; or suppose that these States, in forming the Union, actually reserved this right, as the prerogative of their antecedent sovereignty, these admissions would bring us to the recognition of an immediate diversity in the composition of the Union, which has never hitherto been perceived, and which would, if it really existed, become the source of endless quarrel. The right of secession, on this foundation, would be limited to those States only which can establish a claim to an original or antecedent sovereignty. The Union would be divided into States having the right, and States not having the right—one portion of the Confederacy elevated in rank and majesty above the other. Those having the right would be the Old Thirteen, with the addition of the State of Texas, which came into the Union bringing with it the attributes of a previously existing sovereignty.

The Union now consists—speaking of it as it was at the commencement of the rebellion—of thirty-four States. Of these twenty-one have been created by Act of Congress; and amongst these twenty-one Texas alone had an anterior claim to sovereignty. Twenty of the States, therefore, are as limited sovereign entities, the mere creatures of the National Government.

Can it be claimed for these twenty States that they hold a reserved right to *rescind* their sovereignty, and retire from the Union as independent sovereign States? *Rescindation* is not the word applicable to a sovereign power; what they never had—absolute and independent sovereignty? So there is another distinction that cannot be got rid of—States in the Union that may resume and States that may not resume. These new States, if they do any thing in the way, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the old States, or to elevate them to the rank of Texas. That is the absurd dilemma of secession. Many of these States, if they do any thing, may *seize* upon the right to themselves, and *seize* upon a prerogative they never had, in order to bring them to an equal dignity with the

